includes living up to the pledge I mentioned earlier, that I am making by wearing that white ribbon: I will not commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against women, men, or children. And I commend the other Members of this body for the white ribbons that they courageously wore to, again, raise the awareness of domestic violence and sexual assaults.

We have a serious problem in front of us, Mr. Speaker, in every community in America, but I have hope. America is an amazing country, and I am so privileged to be an American, to be free. I believe that the greatness of this country is a reflection of both the greatness of our founding and the greatness of our people. We are up to and equal to the task of fighting domestic violence and sexual assault if we put our American minds and our American spirits to it.

So, today, as I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, again, to call attention to the scourge of domestic violence and sexual abuse, it's, at the same time, celebrating the wonderful agencies and shelters and volunteers and people who have stepped forth who are willing to take this issue on, who are willing to address it, who are willing to help the victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. We are blessed by their service, by their commitment to society, by their appreciation of the value of human life and their desire to help those who need that help.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the ability to be able to call attention to these issues.

At this time, I want to say to Vera House in Syracuse, as well as all of the shelters and all of the agencies throughout this country, thank you for your service. Thank you for what you do for the victims of domestic violence and sexual assaults.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a minority Member at this time.

KEEPING THE GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to once again bring a case before you that I believe will be overheard in an effective way by the American people and responded to you by, of course, your good judicial and prudential judgment.

I came here to the floor to talk about a number of things. I should always bring up the number one thing that is on my mind first. And I know that it's impossible for me to exhaust the subject, but I have given it a significant

endeavor over the last year and a half. And now, as things move towards a head, with the continuing resolution negotiations and debate that is taking place and the major decisions that will be formed over the weekend by the leadership in the House and in the Senate in consultation, presumably, with the White House, we expect to see some kind of a proposal come before one or both Chambers next week before the clock ticks down on the continuing resolution that is temporarily funding this government in a piece of shell appropriations that should have never have happened. But that's a subject matter perhaps outside of what I should bring up today, and we should focus on the issues at hand, and they are this:

There was a strong pledge that was made that if Republicans win the majority, Mr. Speaker, that we would cut \$100 billion out of this fiscal year's budget. I will submit that, recognizing that we were 5 months into this fiscal year before we had an opportunity to begin that process, that calculates out to be about \$61.5 billion if you annualized \$100 billion. Even though the initially proposed continuing resolution did not include those kinds of cuts, there was an intense debate here in this Congress driven by the 87 freshmen Republicans to get that number up to a number that was either \$100 billion or \$100 billion if you calculated it on an annualized basis.

We did come together on that number, and this House did pass H.R. 1, which included in it \$61.5 billion worth of cuts out of fiscal year 2011, even though, let me say, the function of the House was not functional during the last 2 or 3 years at least of Speaker PELOSI's time, and there was no appropriations process that one could bring forward, and there was no budget that was brought forward and, therefore, government was being run on stopgap measures of continuing resolutions.

During the lame duck session—the lame duck session being the period of time when Congress comes together to meet after an election. I have said that lame duck sessions should only be to take care of the urgent issues that need to be handled before the new Members of Congress can be sworn in. The old Congress, at least in theory, is delegitimized by the elections that take place. Last year, it was on November 2. They no longer represent the will of the American people. That has been reflected in the election results all across the land. And this House was designed to be a quick reaction strike force to be responsive to the American people.

So our Founding Fathers put it within the Constitution, never amended out, that House Members are up for election every 2 years. And every 10 years there will be a census, and that census is designed then to be used to redistrict the districts. And we have now agreed that 435 is the maximum number of House Members. And as the

population moves and as the population grows, every 10 years, we reset the congressional districts to as accurately as possible reflect the new population distribution in America. That goes on, along with every 2 years, there is an election.

So the elections have two purposes. Every 10 years, it is to reflect the population change; and every 2 years, including that 10-year census year election, which comes up in 2012, it's the quick reaction response to the will of the American people. Because our Founding Fathers understood that, if you put people in this office and let them have tenure for life like we are hearing about in States like Wisconsin or Ohio what tenure does to a person's due diligence, then there would be people that would sit here forever and never be responsible to the American people.

□ 1540

They recognize if they would set the Senate up in 6-year election cycles that the Senate wouldn't be accountable within a short period of time, not within 2 years or 4 years, but in 6 years. That was intentionally so the Senators would be more inclined to make long-term visionary decisions, and House Members could come in as the shock troops, so to speak, to bring the quick reaction if the Congress got out of sync with the people.

Well, it's pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress got out of sync with the people last year. Actually, they began to get out of sync with the people well before that, more than 4 years ago.

But when President Obama came in he had huge majorities to work with in the House under NANCY PELOSI as Speaker and in the Senate with HARRY REID as leader, even to the extent that they had a massive majority in the House of Representatives, and they had a filibuster-proof majority in the United States Senate. And so they felt their oats, so to speak.

And their ideology, drove them, I think, to-maybe they didn't know it. I think some of them knew it, and I believe the Blue Dogs that were in this House of Representatives that lost their elections last November knew it. They knew they were walking the plank. They knew they were going down into political Davy Jones' locker if they voted for ObamaCare. But they did, because of leverage, because of legislative shenanigans, because—and I'll say it, Mr. Speaker, that to understand this, that ObamaCare, for a long time here in the House of Representatives, was H.R. 3200, a bill that came through the Energy and Commerce Committee in a fashion that was, at least envisioned, to be a functional fashion through our Constitution and by our Founding Fathers. But it came through, and there were long, long debates in committee, but H.R. 3200, which was the product of the House, didn't make it to the floor for a vote.